UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,856	02/20/2004	Sig Badt JR.	1285-0139US	7646

24587 7590 12/01/2006

ALCATEL USA
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2
PLANO, TX 75075

EXAMINER	
ROSE, HELENE ROBERTA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2163	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/783,856	BADT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Helene Rose	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/20/04&7/18/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. Claims 1-30 have been presented for examination.

2. Claims 1- 30 have been rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/20/2004 and 6/18/2005, accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by examiner.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to because of the following informality: On page 3 of the specification, paragraph [0005], wherein "Inasmuch" is defined, the appropriate spacing between words is needed. Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant is reminded to review the specification for minor informalities such as spelling errors, inconsistent terminology, spacing, numbering of elements, etc.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C – 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnston-Watt et al (US Publication No. 2003/0115311, Date Filed: November 27, 2002).

Claims 1, 11 and 21:

Claims 1, 11 and 21 disclose a provisioning system, a service provisioning system, and a system for provisioning presence utilizing the same functionality. Johnston-Watt teaches a provisioning system, a service provisioning system, and a system for provisioning presence, comprising:

an ontology depository having at least one domain-specific ontology model for a particular presence application (paragraph [0050] and [0051], respectively, Johnston-Watt) ; and

a presence entity having a structure operable to reference a domain-specific ontology model of said ontology depository for customizing a presence client software module associated with said presence entity, whereby said presence entity becomes operable to engage in a particular presence application relating to said domain-specific ontology model (paragraph [0059], wherein it modifies the content for delivery to the mobile device based on information from the user's profile and business rules defined in the business domain ontology that is applicable for the user's place, time and role, wherein a content manager modifies content to be delivered to mobile users and in order to do this it subscribes to profile topics and a selector sub-component maintains a dynamic model of what constitutes relevant content for a particular user, wherein this model is modified on-the-fly to reflect the dynamic changes to users' profiles as they move through time and space, and so forth, and therefore the content subscriptions reflect the relevance of particular topics, Johnson-Watt).

Claims 2, 12, and 22:

Claims 2, 12, and 22, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said at least one domain-specific ontology model for a particular presence application comprises a Unified Markup Language (UML)-based data model (paragraph [0053], wherein the adaptive technology framework, i.e. ATF object model is specified using an UML, Johnston-Watt).

Claims 3, 13, and 23:

Claims 3, 13, and 23, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said at least one domain-specific ontology model for a particular presence application comprises an Extended Markup Language (XML)-based data model (paragraph [0053], wherein the domain metadata is specified in industry standard from using extended markup language (XML), Johnston-Watt).

Claims 4, 14, and 24:

Claims 4, 14, and 24, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said at least one domain-specific ontology model for a particular presence application comprises a semantic net data model (paragraph [0054], wherein use rules base semantic mark up in order to publish content on domain specifics topics, and so forth, Johnson-Watt)

Claims 5, 15, and 25:

Claims 5, 15, and 25, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said at least one domain-specific ontology model for a particular presence application comprises a General Markup Language (GML)-based data model (paragraphs [0054] and [0055], wherein <OrgID>.CALENDAR.<GroupID>.<UserID> is defined, and so forth, and wherein this is interpreted to be the GMI, wherein GMI originated the use of <> and / for the markup and is still

used for document applications, Johnston-Watt).

Claims 6, 16, and 26:

Claims 6, 16, and 26, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said at least one domain-specific ontology model for a particular presence application comprises a data model based on a semantic software application selected from the group consisting of a Resource Description Framework (RDF) application, an Ontology Inference Layer (OIL) application, an Ontology Web Language (OWL) application, a Semantic Web Initiative (SWI)-compliant application, and a Meta Object Framework (MOF) application (paragraph [0062], wherein the adaptive delegation controller layer is made up of a number of sub-components, which is interpreted to be the ontology interference layer; paragraph [0052], wherein emerging web services is defined and [0054], wherein they use rules base semantic markup in order to publish content on domain specific contents, which is interpreted to be the semantic web; and paragraph [0053], wherein paragraph [0053], wherein the resource definition facility documents as defined by W3C, is interpreted and equivalent to resource description framework and together with a domain specific topic hierarchy these can be thought of as constituting a primitive ontology: taxonomy+set of axioms/rules and the ATF is constructed using a combination of generic ontologies such as Dublin Core and industry specific ontologies such as IBM's Insurance Application Architecture, which is interpreted to be the ontology web language and meta object framework, Johnston-Watt)

Claims 7, 17, and 27:

Claims 7, 17, and 27, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said structure operable to reference a domain-specific ontology model comprises a presence client software module operable to

invoke a Universal Resource Locator (URL) path associated with said ontology depository including said domain-specific ontology model (paragraph [0023], wherein the term "content" encompasses application or domain specific data and The term also incorporates an abstract of content or a link to content, wherein the link to content is interpreted to be the URL, Johnston-Watt).

Claims 8, 18, and 28:

Claims 8, 18, and 28, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said structure associated with said presence entity is operable to dynamically reference a domain-specific ontology model of said ontology depository (paragraphs [0050], [0052], [0053], wherein an ontology represents the data model rules that determine how the ATF modifies the information and services delivered to the mobile device and so forth and wherein the ATF is constructed using a combination of generic ontology's such as IBM's insurance application architecture, and wherein domain metadata is specified and so forth, and [0059], respectively, Johnston-Watt).

Claims 9, 19, and 29:

Claims 9, 19, and 29, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said structure associated with said presence entity is operable to effectuate a static reference to a domain-specific ontology model during said structure's compile time (paragraph [0056], respectively, Johnston-Watt).

Claims 10, 20, and 30:

Claims 10, 20, and 30, Johnston-Watt teaches wherein said particular presence application is selected from the group consisting of transportation applications, shipping and delivery applications (paragraphs [0061], wherein enables the content manager to interface to the preferred delivery mechanism, Johnston-Watt), premises security monitoring applications,

private enterprise applications (paragraph [0023], respectively, Johnston-Watt), government agency applications, and instant messaging applications (paragraph [0026], wherein this is a set of distributed server components that implements rule based selection; paragraph [0059], respectively, Johnston-Watt)

Prior Art of Record

1. Trossen et al. (US Publication No. 2005/0136946)
2. Johnston-Watt et al. (US Publication No. 2003/0115311)
3. Trossen et al. (US Publication No. 2004/0260749)

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helene Rose whose telephone number is (571) 272-0749. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HRR
Technology Center 2100
November 24, 2006

ALFORD KINDRED
PRIMARY EXAMINER